

REPLIES TO HUGHES

ROOT ON INCOME TAX AMENDMENT.

Urges Legislature to Adopt It—Sees No Danger to States' Powers.

Albany, Feb. 28.—With an explanation that a difference of legal opinion did not mean any personal controversy, Senator Davenport to-night read in the Senate a letter from United States Senator Elihu Root taking issue with Governor Hughes's position that the wording of the proposed income tax amendment to the federal Constitution would affect incomes derived from state bonds. Senator Root took this informal method of communicating his views to the Legislature, Senator Davenport said, because he felt that it was for the Governor only to send a formal communication to that body.

Senator Root's Letter.

United States Senate, Washington, February 17, 1910. My Dear Senator: Since our conversation last month I have given much consideration to the scope and effect of the proposed income tax amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Much as I respect the opinion of the Governor of the state, I cannot agree with the view expressed in his special message of January 9, and as I advised in my letter to the resolution to submit the proposed amendment it seems appropriate that I should state my views of its effect.

The proposed amendment is in these words: Article 18. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several states and without regard to any census or enumeration.

The objection made to the amendment is that this will confer upon the national government the power to tax incomes derived from bonds issued by the states or under the authority of the states, and will place the borrowing capacity of the state and its governmental agencies at the mercy of the federal taxing power.

It does not find in the amendment any such meaning or effect. I do not consider that the amendment in any degree whatever will enlarge the taxing power of the national government or will have any effect except to relieve the exercise of that taxing power from the requirement that the tax shall be apportioned among the several states.

The effect of the amendment will be, in my view, the same as if it said: "The United States may lay a tax on incomes without apportionment, the tax, and this shall be applicable whatever the source of the income subjected to the tax," leaving the question "What incomes are subject to national taxation?" to be determined by the same principles and rules which are now applicable to the determination of that question.

Must Be Taken Altogether. If we were to construe the proposed amendment only by a critical examination of its words the view upon which the objection is based would be reached by practically cutting the provision in two and reading it as if it read: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived," without the concluding words. But we are not at liberty to do this. The amendment consists of a single sentence, and the whole of it must be read together. It expresses but a single idea, and that is that the tax to which it relates must be laid and collected without apportionment among the several states and without regard to any census or enumeration, while the words "from whatever source derived" are obviously introduced to make the exemption from the rule of apportionment comprehensive and applicable to all taxes on incomes.

We are not left, however, to a mere critical examination of words. This provision, as Mr. Justice Bradley said of the Constitution in the legal tender cases, is "to be interpreted in the light of history and of the circumstances of the period in which it was framed. Justice Story said of another clause of the Constitution, in Brice v. The Bank of Kentucky (11 Peters, 32):

"And I mean to insist that the history of the colonies, before and during the Revolution, and down to the adoption of the Constitution, constitutes the highest and most authentic evidence to which we are to resort in the interpretation of the instrument; and to disregard it would be to fill ourselves to the practical mischief with a false and unmeaning and to forget all the great purposes to which it was to be applied."

This view must necessarily be applied to the proposed amendment if it be adopted. It will be considered in the light of the social and political history which led to the proposal and which appears upon the public records of our government.

What is that history? The Constitution of 1787 conferred upon the national government the power of taxation without any limit whatever, except that taxes on exports were prohibited.

Limits on Taxing Power. The method of exercising the power, however, was subjected to two limitations—one that imports duties and excises should be uniform, and the other that direct taxes should be apportioned among the states. The apportionment provisions were as follows:

Article 1—Section 2. Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several states which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, etc. (Amended, but not in this respect, by the Fourteenth Amendment.)

Article 1—Section 9. No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken.

For more than a hundred years after the adoption of the Constitution various tax laws of Congress were from time to time brought before the courts upon objections that they imposed direct taxes in violation of the rule of apportionment. The decisions of the courts uniformly sustained these laws, from the Hylton case, in 1796, which sustained an unapportioned tax on carriages (3 Dallas, 171), to the Springer case, in 1880, which sustained an unapportioned tax on incomes. (102 U. S., 586.)

In the mean time numerous laws were passed and enforced imposing taxes on incomes without apportionment, and a great part of the means for carrying on the Civil War was derived from such taxes.

Superior Court's Decision. In the year 1885, however, an income tax law included in the Wilson tariff act of 1894 was brought before the Supreme Court in the case of Pollock agt. the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, and in that case the court decided against the law. The case was heard twice. On the first hearing a majority of the court held that a tax on income derived from real estate must be apportioned as a direct tax because a tax on real estate itself would be direct, and the judges divided equally as to whether a tax on income derived from personal property must be apportioned. (157 U. S., 429.)

Upon the second hearing of the case the court, by a majority of five to four, held that a tax upon income derived from personal property must be considered a direct tax and must be apportioned. (158 U. S., 307.) As the judges agreed, however, that taxes on incomes derived from business or occupations need not be apportioned. The effect of these decisions was thus described in one of the minority opinions:

"But the serious aspect of the present decision is that by a new interpretation of the Constitution it so ties the hands of the legislative branch of the government that without an amendment of that instrument, or unless this court, at some future time, should return to the old theory of the Constitution, Congress cannot subject to taxation—however great the needs or pressing the necessities of the government—either the invested personal property of the country, bonds, stocks and investments of all kinds, or the income arising from the renting of real estate, or from the yield of personal property, except by the grossly unequal and unjust rule of apportionment among the states. Thus, undue and disproportionate burdens are placed upon the many, while the few, safely entrenched behind the rule of apportionment among the states on the basis of numbers, are permitted to evade their share of responsibility for the support of the government ordained for the protection of the rights of all."

It was so evidently impossible to collect an income tax by apportionment among the states according to population that the general judgment of the country confirmed the opinion that the decision in the Pollock case had practically taken away from Congress a power of vital importance to the general government—a power the exercise of which had, at least in one time of peril, proved essential to the nation's life.

Need of More Revenue. The attention of the country was sharply called to the need of more government revenue for the first time after the Pollock case by the extraordinary session of Congress which began on March 15, 1905, when the revised tariff bill came into the Senate an amendment to the bill was introduced, providing for the extension of the old income tax provisions of 1884, which the Supreme Court had held to be invalid both as to income derived from real estate and as to income derived from personal property. The avowed and necessary effect of including such provisions in the new tariff law would be to present again to the country the same old questions which had been decided in the Pollock case and to challenge a reversal of their decision. Thereupon the resolution for the submission of this amendment was introduced in the Senate and was passed by Congress.

The proposal followed the suggestions of the majority of the Pollock case. The evil to be remedied was avowedly and manifestly the incapacity of the national government, resulting from the decision that income practically could not be taxed when derived either from real estate or from personal property, although it could be taxed when derived from business or occupation. The terms of the amendment are likely to cure that evil and to take away from the different classes of income considered by the court a practical immunity from taxation based upon the source from which they were derived.

State Securities Immune. There was no question in Congress or in the courts or in the country about the taxation of state securities. No one claimed that the inability of the general government to tax them was an evil. The only question was whether they should be exempt from the tax. The exemption was a part of the Constitution, but from the fact that, being the necessary instruments of carrying on other and sovereign governments, they were not the proper subject of national taxation, and that, therefore, no provisions of the Constitution, however wide the scope of their language, could be held to apply to such securities or to the income from them. Judge Cooley, in his work on Constitutional Law, says:

"The power to tax, whether by the United States or by the states, is to be construed liberally in favor of the power, and the fact that the states and the Union are inseparable, and that the Constitution contemplates the states perform their essential functions, etc."

This rule of construction has been maintained for generations. It is undisputed; it was referred to with approval by the justices who wrote and delivered the opinions in the Pollock case, and it has been declared again and again by the Supreme Court to be not open to question. It is a rule of construction just as controlling in defining the scope of the proposed amendment as it is in defining the scope of the existing provisions of the Constitution.

In the case of our government, the apparently unlimited taxing power conferred by the terms of the Constitution has been held not to apply to the instrumentalities of the state. Under its acts of Congress which, by their express terms, appeared to include the instrumentalities of state government, have uniformly been held not to include them. This uniform, long established and indisputable rule applied to the construction of our Constitution—a rule which has been declared to be essential to a continuance of our dual system of government. Forbid that the words of that instrument conferring the power of taxation shall be deemed to apply to anything but the proper subjects of national taxation. Under it we are forbidden to apply the words "from whatever source derived" in the proposed amendment to any of the instrumentalities of state government.

No New Grant of Power. This amendment will be no new grant of power. The Congress already has power to impose taxes on incomes from whatever source derived, subject to the rule of apportionment which excludes state securities from the operation of the power; but the taxes so imposed must be apportioned among the states. Under the proposed amendment there will be the same and no greater power to tax incomes from whatever source derived, subject to the same rule of apportionment, but that the instrument conferring the power shall be interpreted so that the tax shall be apportioned.

It appears, therefore, that no danger to the powers or instrumentalities of the states is to be apprehended from the adoption of the amendment.

It would be cause for regret if each state were to be rejected by the Legislature of New York.

Should Not Selfish. It is said that a very large part of any income tax under the amendment would be paid by the citizens of New York, but that is undoubtedly true, but there is all the more reason why our Legislature should take special care to exclude every narrow and selfish motive from influence upon its action and should consider the proposal in a spirit of broad national patriotism and

THE DAY IN WASHINGTON

DO YOU REALIZE.—Do you realize that despite all the publicity given to the fact that Secretary Ballinger cancelled an order whereby Secretary Garfield had withdrawn from entry 3,000,000 acres to protect water-power sites, Mr. Ballinger never disturbed other orders of his predecessor? The Guggenheims were in a conspiracy to get hold of these claims; that it is trying to do so still; that the removal of Glavis has never affected in any way the purpose of the administration to cancel these claims? Do you know that not one acre of Alaska coal lands has been patented? Do you realize that Secretary Ballinger has withdrawn for conservation purposes more than 7,000,000 acres since he has become Secretary? These are fundamental facts in connection with the current controversy which must be borne in mind if any way into print. It is also important to bear in mind that Secretary Ballinger has sent to Congress the first actual conservation bills that have ever been framed, that these have received the indorsement of the President and they are part of his legislative programme. With these facts in mind, it may be possible better to separate the chaff from the wheat in this Ballinger-Pinchot controversy.

PRESIDENT'S VICTORY.—As was fore-shadowed in this column, the House Commerce committee on Interstate Commerce bill, including the provision for a special commerce court, the vote in committee standing 10 to 8. This constitutes a marked victory for the President, who has along insisted on the creation of the position of President Roosevelt, who contended when the rate bill was before the Senate that

should act upon it for the best interests of our whole country.

The main reason why the citizens of New York will pay so large a part of the tax is that New York City is the chief financial and commercial center of a great country, with vast resources and industrial activity.

For many years Americans engaged in developing the wealth of all parts of the country have been going to New York to secure capital and market their securities and to buy their supplies. Thousands of men who have amassed fortunes in all sorts of enterprises in other states have come to New York to live because they like the life of the city or because their distant enterprises require representation in New York.

These are the reasons why the citizens of New York are in a great measure derived from the country at large. A continual stream of wealth sets toward the great city from the mines and manufacturers and railroads outside of New York. The United States is no longer a mere group of separate communities embracing a vast territory. It has become a product of organic growth, a vast industrial organization covering and including the whole country, and the relation of New York City to the whole organization of which it is a part is the great source of her wealth and the chief reason why her citizens will pay so great a part of an income tax.

The evil to be remedied was avowedly and manifestly the incapacity of the national government, resulting from the decision that income practically could not be taxed when derived either from real estate or from personal property, although it could be taxed when derived from business or occupation. The terms of the amendment are likely to cure that evil and to take away from the different classes of income considered by the court a practical immunity from taxation based upon the source from which they were derived.

State Securities Immune. There was no question in Congress or in the courts or in the country about the taxation of state securities. No one claimed that the inability of the general government to tax them was an evil. The only question was whether they should be exempt from the tax. The exemption was a part of the Constitution, but from the fact that, being the necessary instruments of carrying on other and sovereign governments, they were not the proper subject of national taxation, and that, therefore, no provisions of the Constitution, however wide the scope of their language, could be held to apply to such securities or to the income from them. Judge Cooley, in his work on Constitutional Law, says:

"The power to tax, whether by the United States or by the states, is to be construed liberally in favor of the power, and the fact that the states and the Union are inseparable, and that the Constitution contemplates the states perform their essential functions, etc."

This rule of construction has been maintained for generations. It is undisputed; it was referred to with approval by the justices who wrote and delivered the opinions in the Pollock case, and it has been declared again and again by the Supreme Court to be not open to question. It is a rule of construction just as controlling in defining the scope of the proposed amendment as it is in defining the scope of the existing provisions of the Constitution.

In the case of our government, the apparently unlimited taxing power conferred by the terms of the Constitution has been held not to apply to the instrumentalities of the state. Under its acts of Congress which, by their express terms, appeared to include the instrumentalities of state government, have uniformly been held not to include them. This uniform, long established and indisputable rule applied to the construction of our Constitution—a rule which has been declared to be essential to a continuance of our dual system of government. Forbid that the words of that instrument conferring the power of taxation shall be deemed to apply to anything but the proper subjects of national taxation. Under it we are forbidden to apply the words "from whatever source derived" in the proposed amendment to any of the instrumentalities of state government.

No New Grant of Power. This amendment will be no new grant of power. The Congress already has power to impose taxes on incomes from whatever source derived, subject to the rule of apportionment which excludes state securities from the operation of the power; but the taxes so imposed must be apportioned among the states. Under the proposed amendment there will be the same and no greater power to tax incomes from whatever source derived, subject to the same rule of apportionment, but that the instrument conferring the power shall be interpreted so that the tax shall be apportioned.

It appears, therefore, that no danger to the powers or instrumentalities of the states is to be apprehended from the adoption of the amendment.

It would be cause for regret if each state were to be rejected by the Legislature of New York.

Should Not Selfish. It is said that a very large part of any income tax under the amendment would be paid by the citizens of New York, but that is undoubtedly true, but there is all the more reason why our Legislature should take special care to exclude every narrow and selfish motive from influence upon its action and should consider the proposal in a spirit of broad national patriotism and

either there should be no court review or there should be a special court to review interstate commerce cases. In order to avoid delay. The members of the committee who stood by the President when the measure came to vote to-day were Representatives Wanger, Esch, Townsend, Keary, Knowland, Hubbard, Miller, Stafford, Calder and Washburn. Representatives Mann, of Illinois, and Stevens, of Minnesota, voted with the six Democrats against the measure. It is predicted that there will be an interesting and protracted debate on the floor of the House, but the leaders have pledged themselves to the President in its support and he has no doubt regarding its final enactment.

POSTAL SAVINGS.—Republican Senators held a protracted conference over the postal savings bank bill to-day. It was attended by Senator Carter, in charge of the bill, and Senators Root, Crane, Gable, Smoot, Crawford, Jones, Curtis, Sutherland and Borah. No decision was reached at the conference, and another will be held, probably to-morrow. It is expected, however, that as a result of the conference an agreement will be reached whereby the bill will receive the solid Republican support, which is what the President wishes. Inasmuch as the proposition was pledged in the national platform, Senator Carter is working indefatigably to secure harmony on all amendments and he believes that his efforts will be crowned with success.

TO RAISE THE MAINE.—The House Committee on Naval Affairs has decided to report favorably the bill of Representative Loud providing for the raising of the battleship Maine, which lies in Havana Harbor. There were a number of bills before the committee, but Secretary Meyer expressed a preference for the Loud bill, and that is the bill which will be reported. It authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to advertise for bids on the work and provides that a contract with Cuba permitting the work to be performed. It is not expected that there will be any serious opposition to the bill on the floor of the House.

G. G. H.

MR. TAFT TO EDITORS.

Talks to American Association of Foreign Newspapers.

[From The Tribune Bureau.] Washington, Feb. 28.—I visited the East Side in New York about two years ago, and I was exceedingly impressed with the fact that all that Jewish population there had recognized the opportunity that this country offered to them, and that the young men and women who attended the public schools and who had settled in that part of New York had appreciated to the full the benefits that this country conferred, and that there was no part of the country in which the real, true spirit of patriotism prevailed more deeply than there.

The President said this to the representatives of three hundred and fifty foreign newspapers published in the United States who called at the White House to protest against the proposed immigration legislation now pending in Congress. Objection was made to the Hayes and Overman bills, and Mr. Hammerling, of the American Association of Foreign Newspapers, who spoke for the delegation, objected to the provisions of these two bills, providing for an educational test, an increase of the head tax and exclusion of all males over sixteen years of age who do not possess \$50.

Mr. Hammerling said that the immigrants did not object to the exclusion of morally and physically undesirable immigrants, but seriously objected to keeping out of the United States any desirable persons. The editor called the President's attention to the fact that 50 per cent of the farmers owning farms and working on farms in the United States had been born in Germany, that about 80 per cent of the \$50,000,000 miners mining the coal to operate the great industries came from abroad, that 90 per cent of the 500,000 steel and iron workers in the United States are immigrants, and that 90 per cent of the labor employed for the last thirty years in constructing and repairing the railways of this country came from Europe.

At the conclusion of Mr. Hammerling's plea in behalf of the immigrants President Taft made an address. He said he was not acquainted with the details of the bills to which his call was made, and he expressed his regret that he could not be present at the meeting of the bill from Congress that he would send for them, and would again listen to whatever objections they wished to make before attaching his signature.

"It is possible that I shall differ with you," said the President, "but I think that where a hearing is given a safer conclusion is likely to be reached. In going about this country thirteen thousand miles, as I did last year," continued Mr. Taft, "the thing which impressed me more than anything else was the fact that the process through which we had gone of welcoming immigrants from everywhere had been a process of naturalization of them with our population, had produced a distinct type of American, as distinguished from any of the people of which that type was made up, and that, therefore, were we to impose unjust burdens and stop immigration we should go back on that which up to this time had produced a better people."

The Secretary of Commerce and Labor was a member of the conference.

BUGHER OUT OF RACE.

President Will Not Make Him Surveyor of Port.

Washington, Feb. 28.—It was learned to-day that President Taft had practically given up the idea of appointing President Bugher, Deputy Post Office Commissioner of New York, as Surveyor of the Port there.

Ever since it was intimated that the President might make this appointment there had been a storm of protest from the Republican leaders in New York, on the ground that Mr. Bugher was a Democrat. President Taft had in Washington since yesterday had a talk with President Taft about the matter of his appointment.

Senator Root and several Congressmen also saw the President to-day. The matter of selecting a successor to Surveyor Clarkson is not a pressing one, as the latter's term does not expire until April 15.

The New York County organization, it is said, will not make any recommendations for the place, as it is a Democratic appointment. The Republican Congressmen from New York City some time ago recommended to the Senators the appointment of Richard Parr, Deputy Surveyor, who was instrumental in exposing the sugar weighing frauds.

It is understood that until he gave up the idea of appointing Mr. Bugher the President had not seriously considered any other names, and that his mind is entirely open on the proposition. He has until early in April to make a choice.

Now that Mr. Bugher is not to become Surveyor, it is not unlikely that in the course of time he will succeed Commissioner Bate as the head of the Police Department. It has been understood that Mayor Gaynor has more than once asked Mr. Bugher, who is now Deputy Police Commissioner, to take charge of the department. To this Mr. Bugher has had to reply that he was not in any position to make a decision at the time. It is thought that the reorganization of the Police Department, which Mayor Gaynor has been working out for some time, has been held up until the future of Mr. Bugher was more certain.

TO PROTECT AMERICAN JEWS.

Washington, Feb. 28.—President Taft has instructed the American Ambassador at St. Petersburg, Mr. Rockhill, to make strong representations to the Russian government looking to the inviolability of American passports in that country. Mr. Rockhill, it is stated, will take the matter up personally with the Russian Emperor.

The publishers of two of the most influential Jewish newspapers in this country, Leon Kaminsky and Jacob Fapshstein, of New York, took up this matter with the President to-day, and told him that for a number of years the Jews of this country had been endeavoring to obtain action which would give American citizens freedom from political arrests in Russia. President Taft said that he was personally deeply interested in the matter and that he had given Mr. Rockhill the instructions referred to above as one of the most important features of his mission to Russia.

MUST GO TO COURT

SENATORS LIABLE.

Justice Wright Rules That They Are Not Above Law.

Washington, Feb. 28.—Justice Wright, in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, to-day decided that the court acted entirely within its authority when it issued the writ of mandamus ordering the joint Committee on Printing of Congress to show cause why it should not consider the bid of the Valley Paper Company, of Holyoke, Mass. This means that the Senate members of the committee will be compelled to appear in court, either in person or by counsel.

In a decision which he took two hours to read from the bench Justice Wright quoted law and precedents in cases and declared that to have refused to issue the mandamus because some of the persons sued occupied the exalted position of Senator "would have been to betray the law."

"No man in this country is so high that he is higher than the law," declared Justice Wright. "All officers are creatures of the law, and even the government of the United States is less than the law. What is there in the exalted position of a Senator which prevents any citizen from laying what he believes to be an injury before the bar of justice?"

The Justice announced that his decision made no attempt to dispose of the merits of the case, but was merely to hold that the court was acting within the authority which had been conferred upon it by Congress itself, and was interpreting the very law which Congress had created.

Members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which committee advised the action of the Senate in ordering its members of the joint Committee on Printing to ignore the order of the District Court, say that these Senators are not in contempt, but only in default. The general impression was that the court would not issue the writ.

The Senate members feel certain that the paper company's protest will be rejected on its merits, and that the question of jurisdiction will not, therefore, be presented to the Supreme Court. The Senator Smoot, chairman of the Senate Committee on Printing, stated that he would make no move whatever, as the whole question was for the Senate.

FOR PATENT COURT.

Bill in Senate Provides Special Tribunal for These Cases.

[From The Tribune Bureau.] Washington, Feb. 28.—Senator Brown made a favorable report from the committee on patents to-day on the bill to create a new court which shall exercise the jurisdiction now exercised by the circuit courts of appeal in patent causes and which shall have no other jurisdiction. The court is to consist of five judges the chief Justice to be appointed by the President for life. The four associate justices are to be designated by the chief Justice of the Supreme Court from among the federal district and circuit judges, for six year terms. The judges so designated are to be paid additional compensation during the period that they are away from their districts or circuits.

Senator Brown points out that under the existing system there are nine courts of last resort in patent cases, with the result that there are great confusion and uncertainty in respect to patent titles. A patent may be decreed valid in eight circuits, but if in the ninth the court declares it invalid the patentee loses all the benefits of the decisions in the eight others because in the ninth circuit anybody may manufacture the article and sell it in any part of the United States.

One of the unique features of Senator Brown's report is that it raises the question of the constitutionality of the measure which is reported for passage. The constitutional points are raised, one being the power of the Chief Justice to designate the four associate judges of the new court, inasmuch as the power to appoint judges is vested in the President by the Constitution. The second point is whether it is possible to increase the salaries of the judges while they are serving on the patent court and to withdraw the increase when they return to their districts or circuits. Mr. Brown suggests that this may be regarded as a reduction of the salary of a federal judge during his term, which is prohibited by the Constitution.

HARD SMOKER LIVES TO BE 110.

Milford, N. H., Feb. 28.—Ten years past the century mark, Michael Leavitt died here to-day. Up to a year ago he walked long distances and did considerable work. Leavitt was an inveterate smoker.

BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS.

The latest publications may be had at the Mercantile Library, Astor Place and Eighth Street, Branch, 141 B'way, Room 715. Books delivered at residences.

The Revolution in baking methods which gave the world Uneeda Biscuit also resulted in a Revelation in soda cracker quality. You realize this the moment you open the royal purple package and find soda crackers so tempting and good that they cannot be resisted. Uneeda Biscuit NATIONAL BISCUIT COMPANY

MUST GO TO COURT FOR BUSINESS BOARD.

Senate Passes Aldrich Bill Creating a System Bureau.

[From The Tribune Bureau.] Washington, Feb. 28.—The only business of importance transacted at to-day's session of the Senate was the passage of the Aldrich bill, creating a government business methods commission. Various amendments to the bill offered by Senator Newlands were voted down, and no rollcall on the passage of the measure was demanded.

The bill provides for the appointment of Senators and five Representatives to constitute the commission. The commission will be able to work out plans which will result in a material saving in the running expenses of the government. When the bill was before the Senate, a week ago, Senator Aldrich said that if he, as a business man, were permitted to run the government he would be able to effect a saving of \$300,000,000 a year.

HEIKE CASE GOES OVER.

Court to Render Decision on Immunity Plea in a Week's Time.

Washington, Feb. 28.—After a sharp conflict between the counsel concerned, the Supreme Court of the United States to-day declined to vacate the order Justice Lurton issued on Friday last staying the trial of Charles R. Heike, a former official of the American Sugar Refining Company, until the Supreme Court reviews the decision of the Circuit Court for the Southern District of New York in regard to his immunity plea.

Heike is charged with conspiracy to defraud the government in the weighing of sugar imported. The court did, however, take the matter under consideration, with the possibility that it may later vacate the order.

The subject was brought before the court by Solicitor General Bowers. He asked that the order be vacated so that Heike might be tried to-morrow "with his subordinate clerks," who were indicted with him.

George S. Graham and J. B. Stanchfield appeared as counsel for Heike, and opposed the request.

A sharp conflict arose as to whether there was a judgment in the case. The Solicitor General offered to show a certified copy of the proceedings, so that the opposing counsel might point out a judgment.

"I don't propose to accept your record," retorted Mr. Graham.

Although counsel for Heike wanted three weeks in which to print the record, they were given one week by the court to print a reply to the request of the government. It is understood the trial of both Heike and the clerks will be held up for a week in order to give the Supreme Court an opportunity to act.

It Took Six Months to Prepare This March China Sale. So It Is No Mushroom. As much of it as can be put on the counters at once will be exhibited and sold today in the great China Store, Second Gallery, New Building. As assortments are depleted they will be quickly renewed by fresh lots from the invoice. This china comes from such celebrated Limoges potteries as THEODORE HAVILAND, POUYAT, CHAS. FIELD HAVILAND, REDON and other French factories, besides less expensive dinner sets from good American works. Fancy china and bric-a-brac will be sold for 25 per cent less than usual. An importer's sample "line" of RICHLY DECORATED FRENCH FANCY CHINA, including chop dishes, cake plates, salad bowls, sugar and cream sets, cups and saucers and various plates, will be sold at exactly fifty per cent less. He can afford to sell it for that. We took all he had and there is probably no other store that could take so large a quantity at once. Some Market Prices Specimen prices for French dinner sets of 100 to 114 pieces, some including BREAD AND BUTTER PLATES, are Redon sets at \$22.50, instead of \$32.50; \$20 instead of \$30. Chas. Field Haviland sets \$20, instead of \$35. Theodore Haviland sets, \$17.50 instead of \$25; \$70, instead of \$100. American sets \$8.50 and \$10, instead of \$15 and \$18. Samples of fancy china, rich in design and new in shape, include Chop dishes, at 50c to \$2.50; regularly \$1.25 to \$6. Cake plates, 50c to \$2; regularly \$1 to \$4. Salad bowls, 50c to \$2; regularly \$1.25 to \$4.50, etc. Beautiful Cut Glass With All-Over Cuttings American cut glass is as fine as is made anywhere. It is sold by the best shops in Paris, London and Vienna, as well as in New York. Eight of the highest grade American cut glass manufacturers have contributed cut glass to sell at 25 to 50 per cent less than our usual low prices. We use the entire output of one factory and keep the other seven busy most of the year, so they are as anxious as we to give our customers something of extra value during this month. Cut glass values are so many that we can instance only a few. Bowls, 8 to 10 inches, \$1.75 to \$11; regularly \$2.75 to \$15. Flower vases, \$1.50 to \$7.50; regularly \$2.50 to \$10.50. Water jugs, \$2.50 to \$4; regularly \$3.75 to \$7. Sugar and cream sets, \$1.85 to \$4.50; regularly \$2.75 to \$7. Footed bonbon compotes, \$1.75 to \$4.50; regularly \$2.50 to \$6.50. Celery trays, \$1.50 to \$3; regularly \$2.50 to \$5. Olive dishes, 60c to \$1; regularly \$1 to \$1.75.